

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action & Formalities

Claims 8-13 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants are amending claim 8 and adding new claim 14. No new matter is added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for initialing the references listed on form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 13, 2002.

The title of the invention is objected to for the reason set forth at page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants are amending the title as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this objection.

The prior art rejections are summarized as follows:

1. Claims 8-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Asada et al. (USP 4,892,418).
2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asada et al. in view of McClain et al. (USP 6,030,663).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 8-11 And 13 In View Of Asada et al.

In rejecting claims 8-11 and 13 in view of Asada et al., the grounds of rejection state that

Asada et al. clearly teaches the construction of a motor comprising:
a boss having a center hole;
a shaft (22) shrinkage-fitted, etc. into the center hole;
a sintered bearing (25), in which lubricant oil (29) is contained;

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/774,105
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

a holder (26); and

a blocking wall member (24), which faces the bearing with a gap having a predetermined width in between; and

wherein the gap is determined to such an extent that the splashed lubricant oil attached to the blocking wall member and depended therefrom returns again onto an outer circumferential wall of the bearing.

Office Action at pages 2-3.

Applicant has amended claim 8 to clarify certain aspects of the invention recited therein.

In particular, amended claim 8 requires that:

- i) one end of the shaft supports the boss and the other end of the shaft is supported by the bearing; and
- ii) the blocking wall is formed on the boss.

According to the above configuration, not only the lubricant oil splashed from the bearing but also the oil splashed from a portion of the shaft between the boss and the bearing is blocked by the blocking wall member. Furthermore, the splashed lubricant oil attached to the blocking wall member can be returned again to the bearing as recited.

In Asada et al., on the other hand, the flange member 24, which the Examiner analogizes to the recited blocking wall member, is not provided on a boss with a center hole. Clearly, therefore, the configuration of Asada et al. significantly differs from that of the present invention as recited in claim 8. Accordingly, neither Asada et al. nor McClain, whether taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the invention recited in claim 8.

Without commenting on the substance of the Examiner's position, Applicant submits that claims 9-11 and 13 are allowable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claim 12 In View Of Asada et al. And McClain et al.

In rejecting claim 12 in view of Asada et al. and McClain et al., the grounds of rejection state that

Asada et al. disclose the construction of a motor as described above.

However, it fails to disclose the use of an oil repellant finishing applied onto the inner face of the blocking wall member.

McClain et al. teach the use of a fabric coating having oil repellant characteristics for the purpose of protecting textile fabrics from acquiring permanent oil stains.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the coating having oil repellant characteristics disclosed by McClain et al. on the motor disclosed by Asada et al. for the purpose of providing an oil repellant surface over the blocking wall member.

Office Action at page 4.

Without commenting on the substance of the Examiner's position, Applicant submits that claim 12 is allowable at least by reason of its dependency.

New Claim

For additional claim coverage merited by the scope of the present invention, Applicant is adding new claim 14. Claim 14 depends from claim 8 and further recites that the bearing is a radial bearing. In Asada et al., on the other hand, the bearing 25 is a thrust bearing, and the configuration is designed to control the flow of oil from this thrust bearing.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/774,105
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Raja Saliba
Registration No. 43,078

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Date: August 30, 2002